



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,949	06/21/2001	Isabelle Afriat	209060US	2772

22850 7590 10/08/2002
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

BERMAN, ALYSIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/884,949		Applicant(s)
Examiner	AFRIAT, ISABELLE		
Alysia Berman	Art Unit	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment and declaration filed July 24, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellul et al. (US 5,851,539).

This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the Office Action mailed January 24, 2002, paper no. 8. For polyols such as propylene glycol and glycerol see column 7, lines 53-56. For electrolytes such as sodium chloride see column 8, line 6. Claim 22 was omitted from the original rejection because of a typographical error. However, it is clear from the rejection of claims 8 and 15 that this subject matter was rejected over the disclosure of US '539.

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,851,539 (539) as applied to claims 1-22 and 25-29 above, and further in view of Hawley, G. G., The Condensed Chemical Dictionary, 10th Ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, NY, 1981, page 423.

US '539 teaches all the limitations of the claims as stated in the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection in paper no. 8. It does not disclose or suggest adding a lower alcohol such as

ethanol to the compositions. Hawley discloses that ethanol is a common ingredient in cosmetics and acts as a solvent for fats and oils.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare the composition of US '539 and add ethanol as taught by Hawley for its solvent properties.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that US '539 does not attach any significance to having 80% or more aqueous phase or using silicone emulsifiers that are dimethicone copolyols comprising only oxyethylene groups. The Rule 1.32 Declaration and the data provided in the specification have been considered but are not persuasive. US '539 discloses that the aqueous phase may be as much as 90% of the composition, which overlaps with Applicant's instantly claimed range. None of the data provided shows clear and convincing unexpected results of the instant invention over the prior art. Firstly, the declaration and examples in the specification are not commensurate in scope with the instant independent claims. The declaration states that compositions containing 80% or more of an electrolyte containing aqueous phase break more readily than the comparative compositions. The aqueous phase of the compositions in the declaration and the examples in the specification also contain glycerol. The instant independent claims do not require an electrolyte or glycerol in the aqueous phase. Additionally, the

graphs provided are unclear because they are not labeled and it is unclear what the different lines represent.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to select particulars of the instantly claimed invention because there is no disclosure in US '539 that would lead on to expect any beneficial effect. US '539 discloses that the compositions can contain all of the components instantly claimed within the instantly claimed concentration ranges and ratios. It is within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters in a composition in order to achieve a beneficial effect. *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 198). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to vary the proportions of components in a composition to arrive at the best compositions for the intended purpose. "It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Only if the "results optimizing a variable" are "unexpectedly good" can a patent be obtained for the claimed critical range. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6, 8 (CCPA 1977); see also *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 692, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1901 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (in banc). Applicant has not shown any criticality in the particulars of the instant invention over the prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alycia Berman whose telephone number is 703-308-4638. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on 703-305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 or 703-872-9307 for after-final communications.

Art Unit: 1619

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1234 or 703-308-1235.


Alycia Berman
Patent Examiner
October 3, 2002


RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200